

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on June 22, 2007.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-27 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by George, et al. (US Patent 6,772,241). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. George, *et al.* does not disclose or suggest each and every aspect set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim.*** *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The ***identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.*** *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to power management systems and methods that intelligently manage a state machine's wake state and signal processing in order to reduce state machine power consumption. In particular, independent claim 1 recites ***a state management component that evaluates a signal to ascertain whether at least one of a coprocessor or a state machine services the signal.*** Similarly, independent claims 13, 20 and 25-27 recite ***a component that interprets the signal to determine whether at least one of a coprocessor or a state machine can process the signal.*** George, *et al.* does not disclose or suggest these novel features.

George, *et al.* relates to a system and method that facilitates selective delivery of an interrupt to one of multiple processors that have independent operating systems.

*Depending on the mode of the system, a controller is configured to deliver interrupts to a co-processor when the host processor is off, without turning the host processor on. In particular, the system is configured to operate in one of three modes: Full ON, Limited ON, and Listen. In Full On mode, both the processor and co-processor are on. In Limited ON mode, the processor is off and the co-processor is on and configured as the master device. In Listen mode, the processor is off while the co-processor is partially on and configured as the master device. Depending on the mode of operation of the system, the controller delivers an incoming interrupt to device that is on and configured as the master device. On page 2 of the Final Office Action (dated May 07, 2007), the Examiner asserts that the teachings of George, et al. relate to a state management component that evaluates a signal to ascertain whether at least one of a coprocessor or a state machine services the signal. Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. The controller disclosed by George, et al. does not evaluate or interpret the incoming signal and/or intelligently direct the signal to a device based on the signal interpretation. The controller merely, forwards the interrupt to whichever device is on. The operating mode of the system a device as the master device but is independent of the incoming interrupt. Thus, George, et al. fails to teach or suggest *a component that interprets an interrupt to determine whether at least one of a coprocessor or a state machine can process the signal.**

Applicants' claimed subject matter, in contrast, discloses a system that intelligently decides which out of a coprocessor or a state machine can process an incoming signal, based its evaluation, and wakes the appropriate device to service the request by transitioning it to a high power state. In particular, a state management is utilized to interpret the received signals. The state management component analyzes the signals to determine processing requirements. Such analysis can employ intelligence that utilizes inferences, classifiers, probabilities, statistics, and rule bases, for example. Based on the analysis it is determined that a respective state machine should respond to the signals. The state management component then invokes (*e.g.*, wakes-up, activates and notifies) the identified state machine to transition to the higher power state, wherein the signal can be conveyed to the state machine. If it is determined that the signal processing component can respond to the signal, the state management component invokes the signal

processing component whereas if it is determined that both the signal processing component and the state machine should respond to the signal, the state management component invokes both devices. (*See* page 8, lines 5-31). Thus, upon receiving a signal, the state management component can interpret the signal, which can include extracting information from and/or analyzing the signal, to determine whether the computer or a low power coprocessor should respond to the signal. (*See* page 10, lines 10-13). George, *et al.* is silent with respect to a component that determines a device that processes an incoming signal, based on an analysis of the incoming signal.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that George, *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest the subject invention as recited in claims 1, 13, 20 and 25-27 (and claims 2-12, 14-19 and 21-24 that depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP563US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731